

# Public Document Pack



## AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL

### Democratic Services

Please ask for: devcon@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk;  
Switchboard: 01296 585858  
Text Relay Prefix your telephone number with 18001  
7 January 2020

### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

A meeting of the **Development Management Committee** will be held at **1.00 pm on Thursday 9 January 2020** in **The Oculus, Aylesbury Vale District Council, The Gateway, Gatehouse Road, Aylesbury, HP19 8FF**, when your attendance is requested.

Contact Officer for meeting arrangements: devcon@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk;

**Membership:** Councillors: T Mills (Chairman), A Bond (Vice-Chairman), J Brandis, M Collins, P Cooper, N Glover, R Khan, S Morgan, M Rand, Sir Beville Stanier Bt, D Town and P Strachan (ex-Officio)

### AGENDA

#### 7. 19/03076/APP - 21 CHURCHWAY, HADDENHAM - SITE VISIT REPORT (Pages 3 - 6)

Internal rearrangements and changes to ceiling, windows and doorways. Part demolition of existing single storey rear extension, demolition of existing garage and outbuilding. Removal of lintel, and small wall above over gateway. Part two storey, part single storey rear extension. Erection of new detached garage. Change fenestration and remove tile hanging to previous extension and re-render the previous extension.

The application was deferred at Development Management Committee on 19 December 2019 for a site visit. The report of that site visit will follow as a supplementary report.

Case officer: Adam Thomas – ([athomas@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk](mailto:athomas@aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk))



This page is intentionally left blank

---

## **COMMITTEE SITE VISIT**    App No. 19/03076/APP

---

**Proposal:** Internal rearrangements and changes to ceiling, windows, walls and doorways. Part demolition of existing single storey rear extension, demolition of existing garage and outbuilding. Removal of lintel, and small wall above over gateway. Part two storey part single storey rear extension. Erection of new detached garage. Change fenestration and remove tile hanging to previous extension and re-render the previous extension.

**Address:** 21 Churchway, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire HP17 8AB

**At the previous Committee Meeting:**            **19 December 2019**  
**Officers Recommendation:**                    **Approval**

### **Late Items:**

Members attention was drawn to the speakers item circulated as well as the corrigendum outlining the recommendation of approval and the suggested conditions following receipt of amended plans.

### **Public Speakers:**

The Committee was addressed by:

Mr Wilkinson of No. 23 Churchway & Mr Rixon of No.19 Churchway

- Mr Wilkinson raised concerns with his right to light and that the first floor three metre extension to the rear of the property would restrict light to his kitchen window, he also questioned the need for a large dressing area within the 1960's extension.
- Mr Rixon raised concerns with the noise that may be generated by traffic movement around the rear of the property to the proposed garage and questioned what materials would be used for the driveway, as well as the scale of the garage.
- Cllr Brandis asked if the kitchen (of no 23) was used more as a modern living area which was confirmed by Mr Wilkinson as being used the most out of all rooms in the house.

Mr Morgan the agent for the application also addressed the committee:

- Mr Morgan outlined the consideration that had been given to the development to respect the listed building and the surrounding listed buildings also, with the majority of the works to the 1960's side/rear extension and rendering the previous extension also to improve its appearance. As well as consideration to avoid any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity in the design. Amendments to address neighbours concerns relating to amenity were considered, and this result in the reduction in height of the first floor extension and reduction and repositioning of the detached garage.
- Cllr Morgan asked if the balcony had now been removed from the proposals which was confirmed by Mr Morgan.
- Cllr Cooper asked if the neighbours projection drawings of the extension were accurate which Mr Morgan confirmed and the Councillor voiced that he considered

there had not been adequate time given to consider these prior to committee.

- Cllr Rand asked for clarification on the ridge height of the garage
- Cllr Brandis commented that light had been reduced already to the kitchen window of No.23 by the dwelling and that No. 23's kitchen is a well used room.

During technical questions the following points were raised:

- Cllr Cooper asked if there is a loss of light in planning terms and asked about the statutory tests and how this is assessed.
- Mr Ray (AVDC) outlined how right to light is separate legislation, but restriction in terms of loss of light in relation to residential amenity is considered and it was concluded by the LPA that due to the distance of the window from the extension it was not considered to have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenity.
- Cllr Cooper stated that he believed a Site Visit was necessary.
- Cllr Rand asked if it was the only window that would be affected in the neighbouring dwelling and this was confirmed.

A motion was then put forward by Cllr Brandis for a site visit as the member was concerned that the restriction of light needed further consideration.

- Cllr Rand voiced that he believed the committee should support the officers recommendation.

Deferred for site visit, 8 for 1 against.

**Site Visit:** 06 January 2020 At: 11:30am

**Those Attending:** Members: Cllrs Mr Mills, Mrs Glover, Mr Cooper, Mr Rand & Mrs Brandis

Local Member: Cllr Mrs J Brandis

Apologies:

Officers: Adam Thomas, Daniel Ray, Claire Bayley (AVDC)

#### **Features inspected:**

Members initially viewed the site from the opposite side of the highway where the planning officer pointed out key changes to the front elevation, members proceeded to enter the application site walking along the south side of the dwelling through the vehicle access. The planning officer then outlined further changes to the 1960's rear/side extension, the garage to be demolished and the rear first floor and ground floor extension proposed. It was also acknowledged that it was Mr Rixon of No. 19 to the south that had raised concerns with the noise generated from vehicle movements through this area and round to the rear of his property.

Members then walked through the existing extension to the rear of the property where the fenestration changes, the rear extensions and demolition was outlined, as well as acknowledgement of the location of the neighbouring kitchen window of No. 23. Members

then walked to the rear of the garden to view the proposed location of the garage, with the removal of the current garden building, as well as gain another view of the proposed location of the side/rear extensions, tree removal and replacements were also noted.

A visit was then made to No. 23 to view the potential impact upon the south facing kitchen window of this neighbour, the proposed location of the first floor extension from this position was outlined by the officer. A visit was then also made to neighbouring property No.19 to view the host dwelling from the rear garden. From No. 19 the location of the proposed extension was noted as well as the proposed location of the detached garage to the west. The size and height of the garage were discussed as well as the proposed roof materials. The proposed new window at first floor of the south elevation was discussed which is proposed as obscure glazed and can be non-opening, as well as mentioning the location of the proposed roof lights. It was also raised that the boundary wall between the dwellings would need to be preserved with the demolition of the garage, and the wall built up and finished with a coping as with the existing wall further along.

### **Discussion:**

- Cllr Cooper stated he believed the changes in white render and windows to the front elevation as an improvement to the dwelling. In terms of the restriction of light from the proposal to the kitchen window of No. 23, the member noted that there may be some affect but due to the distance away from the window that the 3 metre extension may be unlikely to result in an unacceptable level of harm in comparison to the existing arrangement. The member commented that the garage does not appear to be in a prominent position and is in limited views. The member noted that assuming the boundary wall with No. 19 was continued at its current height it may be an improvement in appearance and details should be conditioned with coping in the style of other walls in Haddenham if approved. The member commented that the works would appear to be an improvement to the dwelling.
- Cllr Rand agreed with the comments of Cllr Cooper and commented that the south boundary wall would need to be continued and capped if approved and discussed the projection drawings provided by the neighbour at No. 23 of the impact the extension would have, noting that the angle of the extension in relation to the window needs to be considered also. The member also noted that the detached garage as proposed in its position seemed appropriate.
- Cllr Glover reflected Cllr Cooper's views that the works would appear to be an improvement to the listed building.
- Cllr Mills commented that he largely agreed with other views and was initially concerned with the removal of the lintel over the access but is now in better understanding following the site visit. The removal of the garage would appear to improve the appearance from the street and allow views through to the rear garden. The member considered there did not seem to be concerns of overlooking to the south and that the garage position seemed appropriate. There may be a minimal impact on light to the kitchen of No. 23, but was of the opinion that sun light may not be restricted to an unacceptable level. The member also commented that it would be good to see the house back in use.
- Cllr Brandis commented that It was a good visit to clarify matters and that the proposal would appear to modernise the dwelling. The garage seems appropriate although the neighbour would be aware of it. There may be some loss of light to the kitchen of No. 23, but this would not appear to be too different to the existing arrangement due to the distance away from the extension.

This page is intentionally left blank